Signature

PTO/SB/21 (05-03) Approval for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. **Application Number** 09/977,138 TRANSMITTAL Filing Date Oct 12, 2001 **FORM** First Named Inventor Odom, Wayne Art Unit 3713 (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) **Examiner Name** C. Marks Total Number of Pages in This Submission Attorney Docket Number ODOM01-01 **ENCLOSURES** (check all that apply) After Allowance Communication Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) to Group Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to Group Petition Amendment / Reply (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application After Final Proprietary Information Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please **Terminal Disclaimer** Extension of Time Request identify below): Revised Appeal Brief in Triplicate **Express Abandonment Request** Request for Refund Copy of Notice of Non-Compliance Return postcard Information Disclosure Statement CD, Number of CD(s) Certified Copy of Priority Remarks RECEIVED Document(s) Response to Missing Parts/ MAR 2 4 2004 Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 **TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700** SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Anderson & Morishita, L.L.C. or Individual Signature March 15, 2004 Date CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. Typed or printed name Kellie D. Çarr

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents. P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date

March 15, 2004

Application No. Applicant(s) Vetixication of Non-Compliance ODOM ET AL. 09/977,138 With 37 CFR 1.192(c) Examiner Art Unit MAR 1 9 2004 C. Marks 3713 e MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 09 January 2004 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three TIME PERIODS: (1) ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) TWO MONTHS from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.

1. The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper

		hea	ading or in the proper order.	· //	
2.			e brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims pealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).	, pending or cancelled, or	does not identify the
3.			least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final retement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192		s not contain a
4.			e brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed i d line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference charact	•	specification by page
5.	\boxtimes	The	e brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues pre-	sented for review (37 CFF	R 1.192(c)(6)).
6.		As	single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more clai	ms in this application, and	I
	(a)		the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the ar		
	(b)		the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c) together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof		
7.		The	e brief does not present an argument under a separate heading	for each issue on appeal	(37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
8.		The	e brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims	as an appendix thereto (3	37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
9.	\boxtimes	Oth	ner (including any explanation in support of the above items):		
		<u>See</u>	e Continuation Sheet	o.Wall	lorg

RECEIVED

MAR 2 4 2004

Teresa Walbarg Supervisory Patent Examiner **Group 3700**

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Continuation of 9. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items): 1) The status of amendments is incorrect as only amendments after final need be identified in this section. In the present case, there are no such amendments; therefore, nothing should be identified.

- 2) The issues presented are incorrect as there should only be two issues in the case. Issue #1 and #3 are correct as they identify the rejections present. Issues #2 and #4 are merely arguments relating to Issues #1 and #3 and are just a more specific restatement of such and thus are not separate issues at hand, just restatements of previously identified issues.
- 3) The grouping of the claims is also incorrect as there are multiple claims shared among the groups. The grouping should match the issues presented and thus reflect the grouping of the rejections with each claim belonging to one group. There should be two groups wherein Group 1 would include claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-20, 22-30, 32-38 and 40-48 and Group 2 would include claims 5, 15, 21, 31 and 39. If so desired by the Applicant, claims within the group can then be recited to not stand or fall together. If the Applicant desires to make this recitation, each of these claims must be argued as separately patentable in the argument section.